REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Official Action mailed **12 June 2008** the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 10, 13, 21, 22, 25, and 33. Examiner objected to claims 10, 22, and 33 because of informalities. Examiner rejected claims 1, 10, 13, 22, 25, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Abramson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,494, hereinafter "Abramson"), and Sandhu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,985,953, hereinafter "Sandhu"), in further view of RFC 1321.

Record of Interview

Examiner England and Applicant's representative, Shun Yao, conducted a telephone interview on 05 September 2008. Applicant proposed amendments to claim 1 and explained the distinctions between the claimed invention and Abramson. Examiner instructed Applicant to formally submit these amendments with detailed explanations of these differences.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramson in view of Sandhu and RFC 1321. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are not obvious over Abramson, Sandhu, and RFC 1321, because none of these references discloses that (1) different servers contain **different content** and perform **different functions**, and (2) different servers share the same SSL session **using the same SSL session ID**.

Abramson Uses Servers with Same Content to Back Up Each Other

The main reference used by Examiner in rejecting the SSL-session-sharing feature of the present claimed invention is Abramson. However, the Abramson

system uses multiple servers with the **same content** to back up one another in server failure situations. See Abramson, Abstract, lines 8-11:

> "A [web] session is automatically routed to a second application server to process a request if the application server handling the session should fail or not have the requested application."

Also, see Abramson, col. 3, lines 24-26:

> "In one preferred embodiment, each application server 24 has the **same content**, and the load is distributed among them." (emphasis added)

Note that the Abramson system is essentially a "server farm," where multiple identical application servers are used to balance the load of web requests, and also used as substitutes to each other when failure occurs.

In contrast, in the present invention, the two servers involved in the same SSL session contain different content and perform different functions. See, e.g., FIG. 1, "related servers 111" of the instant application. For example, as illustrated in in FIG. 1 of the instant application, some servers are responsible for user authentication (login authentication servers 116, 117, and 118), some are responsible for access control (access control server 122), some are responsible for maintaining credit card records (credit card server 112), some are responsible for maintaining advertisement information (advertisement server 114), and some are main web servers (main web servers 128). These servers contain different content and perform different functions from one another.

Hence, Abramson does not disclose that the second server contains different content and performs different functions from the first server. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the independent claims to clarify that in the present invention the second server contains different content and performs different functions from the first server. These amendments find support in page

8, line 18 – page 19, line 5 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

The Abramson System Must Use New Session ID

Applicant further points out that, for the Abramson system to work, a second application server (which replaces the previously failed first server) must generate a new session ID to identify the new session. See Abramson, Abstract, lines 17-19:

> "The user's session data is recovered from that backup server and reconstituted into a **new session**, **with a new session ID**." (emphasis added)

Also, see Abramson, FIG. 4, step 250 "Create New Session With New Session ID."

Note that the Abramson system **requires the generation of a new session ID** to function properly, because each session ID identifies the IP address of the application server in operation and the IP address of the corresponding backup server that stores the session's state information. See Abramson, FIG. 3 and col. 3, lines 54-60. When server failure occurs, the Abramson system switches a client request to a second application server, which in turn retrieves the session state and establishes a **new session with a new session ID**. See Abramson, col. 4, lines 61-64:

> "That session data is reconstituted into a **newly created session**, **with a new session ID** (step 250), so that subsequent requests will be routed directly to the newly assigned application server 24b." (emphasis added)

In contrast, in the present claimed invention, the second server continues to use the same SSL session with the **same SSL session ID** as the first server. See amended claim 1, lines 17-18, 27-29. Specifically, FIG. 5 and the associated description on page 12, line 20 to page 13, line 13 of the instant application clearly states that the second server uses the same SSL session ID to retrieve the session statement information and establish the SSL session using the same SSL session state information with the same SSL session ID. (Note that the SSL session ID is part of the SSL session state information. See FIG. 2 of the instant application.)

Therefore, Abramson does not disclose that the second server uses the same SSL session ID to establish an SSL session with the client, which is recited in lines 27 – 29 of claim 1, lines 27 – 29 of claim 13, and lines 30 – 32 of claim 25.

Hence, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claim 10, which depends from claim 1, claim 22, which depends from claim 13, and claim 33, which depends from claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By __/Shun Yao/_____
Shun Yao
Reg. No. 59,242

Date: 8 September 2008

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com